

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 30, 2003

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Bob Barnard called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Bob Barnard, Planning Commissioners Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Vlad Voytilla, and Scott Winter. Planning Commissioner Shannon Pogue was excused.

Development Services Manager Steven Sparks, Senior Planner John Osterberg, Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Barnard, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Barnard asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Staff had no communications at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Barnard opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

1 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

2

3 **A. CU 2003-0004 – SISTERS OF ST. MARY’S GYM ADDITION**

4 **CONDITIONAL USE**

5 **B. DR 2003-0013 – SISTERS OF ST. MARY’S GYM ADDITION**

6 **DESIGN REVIEW**

7 The applicant requests Conditional Use and Design Review

8 approval for the construction of a new gymnasium and

9 associated amenities on the existing Valley Catholic High School

10 campus. The gymnasium is proposed to be located on the east

11 side of the existing track facility and abutting existing campus

12 buildings, with few track and field events to be relocated to

13 accommodate the proposal.

14

15 Commissioners Voytilla, Winter, Johansen, and Bliss indicated that

16 they had visited the site and had no contact with any individual(s)

17 with regard to this proposal.

18

19 Observing that they had not visited the site specifically with regard to

20 these applications, Commissioner Maks and Chairman Barnard

21 pointed out that they were familiar with the site and had no contact

22 with any individual(s) with regard to the proposal.

23

24 Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson presented the Staff Reports and

25 briefly explained the purpose of the two applications submitted for this

26 proposal for the construction of a new 27,000 square foot gymnasium

27 and associated amenities, including a lobby, locker room, weight room,

28 multi-purpose room, Athletic Department offices, and storage, on the

29 existing campus of the Valley Catholic High School. He explained that

30 this addition is an effort to accommodate the existing enrollment and

31 staff, emphasizing that no new activities or functions are proposed and

32 that no additional traffic is anticipated. He described the existing site

33 of the facility, observing that the primary access comes from SW

34 Boulevard and SW 148th Avenue. Pointing out that certain Conditions

35 of Approval are identified within both Staff Reports, he mentioned that

36 although the Conditional Use Staff Report includes a third Condition

37 of Approval that references Facilities Review Conditions of Approval,

38 no Facilities Review Conditions of Approval are associated with the

39 Conditional Use application. Concluding, he recommended approval of

40 both applications, including recommended Conditions of Approval, and

41 offered to respond to questions.

42

43 Commissioner Bliss requested a correction to line 5 of paragraph 4 on

44 page 13 of the Conditional Use Staff Report, as follows: “...mitigated

1 through a ~~stromwater~~ **stormwater** management fee-in lieu, as
2 reviewed through the...”
3

4 Mr. Ryerson pointed out another correction on line 2 of paragraph 5 of
5 page 20 of the Conditional Use Staff Report, as follows: “...reviewing
6 stormwater facilities and increase in impervious surfaces, which the
7 **City of Beaverton reviews. At the site development stage,**
8 **Clean Water Services receives a copy of the site development**
9 **application for a review opportunity.**”
10

11 Referring to paragraph 5 of page 17 of the Conditional Use Staff
12 Report (6.2.2.b), Mr. Bliss pointed out that although this section
13 indicates that Facilities Review had conditioned the applicant to
14 construct a six-foot sidewalk along SW Murray Boulevard in order to
15 comply with the policy of providing multi-modal connectivity access in
16 the City, the Conditional Use Facilities Review includes no Conditions
17 of Approval.
18

19 Mr. Ryerson clarified that that this is addressed in paragraph 3 of the
20 same page (6.2.2.a), noting that this also includes the Design Review
21 Facilities Review Committee Conditions of Approval.
22

23 Commissioner Bliss questioned the status of the conditioned six-foot
24 sidewalk in the event that the Conditional Use is approved and the
25 Design Review is denied.
26

27 Mr. Ryerson explained that this involves a modification of the original
28 Conditional Use of that site, observing that the proposed sidewalk is
29 specifically associated with the Design Review application.
30

31 Referring to paragraph 5 of page 2 of the letter from Washington
32 County, dated March 25, 2003, with regard to trip generation obtained
33 from the ITE manual which indicates that a 25% increase in traffic
34 would be generated by the proposal, while the applicant has indicated
35 that no traffic increase is anticipated, Commissioner Johansen
36 questioned the possibility that Washington County had not understood
37 the proposal.
38

39 Mr. Ryerson expressed his opinion that the information with regard to
40 the anticipated 25% increase in traffic is not correct, emphasizing that
41 the applicant's Traffic Report indicates that no increase is anticipated.
42 On question, he advised Commissioner Johansen that this should not
43 affect the ability of the Planning Commission to make a decision on
44 this issue.

1 Commissioner Johansen questioned which NAC is associated with this
2 proposal.

3
4 Mr. Ryerson advised Commissioner Johansen that the West Beaverton
5 NAC is associated with this proposal, observing that both the Five
6 Oaks/Triple Creek NAC and Central Beaverton NAC are located near
7 the site.

8
9 Observing that there had been no response from the West Beaverton
10 NAC and that it appears that no one had attended the Neighborhood
11 Meeting, Commissioner Johansen requested further information with
12 regard to the efforts made by the applicant.

13
14 Mr. Ryerson noted that the sign-in sheet included the Sisters and the
15 applicant team only, adding that the applicant had provided
16 appropriate notification as required by the Development Code.

17
18 Commissioner Maks questioned whether the applicant had actually
19 followed the required procedure, emphasizing that they are supposed
20 to contact the NAC and attempt to attend the NAC Meeting.
21 Observing that the West Beaverton NAC generally makes a significant
22 effort to have the applicant in attendance at their meeting, he pointed
23 out that it does not appear that the applicant had followed the
24 procedure that requires them to attend the NAC Meeting.

25
26 Commissioner Voytilla referred to the Design Review Staff Report,
27 specifically Condition of Approval No. 5, which indicates that
28 deciduous trees can be supplied bare root provided the roots are
29 protected against damage, observing that more detail is necessary and
30 that there should be some direction with regard to which time of year
31 bare roots are permitted. Referring to Condition of Approval No. 6,
32 which indicates that evergreen trees must be balled and burlapped, he
33 pointed out that tree spades are a recognized method in the industry.
34 He discussed Condition of Approval No. 8, which provides that shrubs
35 shall be supplied in two-gallon containers with a minimum spread of
36 12-inches to 15-inches, expressing his opinion that this creates a rather
37 tight situation.

38
39 Mr. Ryerson emphasized that this has been a standard Board of
40 Design Review Condition of Approval.

41
42 Commissioner Voytilla referred to Condition of Approval No. 13, which
43 addresses exterior lighting, pointing out that the Planning Commission
44 has been utilizing a particular standard with regard to measurable foot

1 candles at the property line, and clarified that foot candles is the
2 measurable standard pertaining to light intensity.

3
4 Reiterating that several standard Board of Design Review Conditions
5 of Approval have been included, Mr. Ryerson pointed out that it is
6 anticipated that some of these standard Conditions of Approval would
7 be revised.

8
9 Commissioner Voytilla referred to No. 5 on page 4 of 10 of the
10 Facilities Review in the Design Review Staff Report, and questioned
11 how staff has been assured that adequate means are provided or can
12 be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary
13 normal replacement of the private common facilities and areas.

14
15 Mr. Ryerson responded that the applicant has provided adequate
16 maintenance in the past.

17
18 Commissioner Voytilla expressed concern with issues that could be
19 created by establishing this precedence, observing that he anticipates
20 that future applicants might expect the same consideration.

21
22 Mr. Ryerson pointed out that while staff has attempted to address each
23 issue, they are not always successful in resolving every potential
24 element.

25
26 Commissioner Voytilla discussed situations in which other individuals
27 and agencies throughout the community would rent this facility for
28 their events, observing that these activities would generate additional
29 spectators, which would create additional traffic and the need for
30 additional parking as well.

31
32 **APPLICANT:**

33
34 **SISTER BARBARA JEAN LAUGHLIN**, representing the applicant,
35 *Sisters of St. Mary's of Oregon*, observed that the school is currently
36 celebrating 100 years of educational services on this site, emphasizing
37 that they hope to continue for many more years. Noting that the cur-
38 rent elementary school gymnasium is the oldest building on the entire
39 campus, she explained that this building had been constructed in 1931.
40 She explained that the proposal would allow the K – 6 students to
41 utilize the existing gymnasium, while the middle school and high
42 school students would utilize the new facility. She pointed out that
43 enrollment would remain at the current level and that there would be
44 no increase in use or traffic at the site. She mentioned that the

1 applicant hopes to begin fund-raising immediately, with construction
2 to begin during the summer. Referring to page 6 of the Conditional
3 Use Staff Report, she pointed out that the primary access is from SW
4 Murray Boulevard and SW 149th Avenue, rather than SW Murray
5 Boulevard and SW 148th Avenue, and that the traffic signal is located
6 at SW Farmington Road and SW 149th Avenue, rather than SW
7 Farmington Road and SW 148th Avenue. Concluding, she offered to
8 respond to questions.

9
10 **ROB CHURCH**, representing *Soderstrom Architects, P.C.*, on behalf of
11 the applicant, *Sisters of St. Mary's of Oregon*, mentioned that staff and
12 Sister Laughlin had adequately described the proposal. He discussed
13 the location and site as it relates to the proposed gymnasium addition,
14 and provided illustrations of the site, proposed building, and proposed
15 floor plan. He described the designs of the existing and proposed
16 structures, as well as the proposed materials, colors, and textures, and
17 offered to respond to questions.

18
19 Commissioner Winter requested clarification with regard to when the
20 aerial photograph had been taken.

21
22 **DAVE RIANDA**, representing the *Sisters of St. Mary's of Oregon*,
23 advised Commissioner Winter that he believes that the aerial
24 photograph had been taken in the 1990's.

25
26 Commissioner Winter questioned the location of the elementary school
27 within the site, and whether he is correct in his assumption that there
28 are currently three gymnasiums located within the school.

29
30 Sister Laughlin clarified that the elementary school gymnasium had
31 been constructed in 1931, and explained that while this facility can be
32 used for practices, the Fire Code prohibits the use of this facility for
33 events.

34
35 Mr. Church pointed out that a great deal of activity occurs within this
36 small gymnasium.

37
38 Emphasizing that he is not attempting to be confrontational,
39 Commissioner Winter questioned whether another full gymnasium
40 would generate additional traffic.

41
42 Mr. Church explained that the facility would be dealing with the same
43 amount of games and spectators following the proposed addition.
44

1 Commissioner Maks pointed out that his involvement with the school
2 district makes him aware of the great demand for gymnasiums and
3 facilities, adding that it is necessary to determine that there would not
4 be a significant increase in overall use of this facility, or if so, what the
5 impact would be.

6
7 Sister Laughlin explained that the original gymnasium served an all
8 girls school, adding that since the facility changed to co-ed, the amount
9 of time for practice has increased. She pointed out that often students
10 arrive as early as 5:30 a.m. or 6:00 a.m. and/or do not leave until 10:00
11 p.m., emphasizing that staff has concerns with these students with
12 regard to sleep requirements and curfew.

13
14 Commissioner Maks advised Sister Laughlin that he would like
15 documentation with regard to any potential net increase in vehicular
16 trips due to an out-of-season sport utilizing the gymnasium. He
17 requested clarification with regard to the location of HVAC equipment
18 associated with this proposal.

19
20 Mr. Church indicated the location of the HVAC equipment on the
21 illustration, observing that this equipment would be situated above the
22 proposed locker rooms and screened by an approximately 8½ foot solid
23 parapet.

24
25 Commissioner questioned whether a document is available from the
26 Neighborhood Meeting requesting information with regard to their
27 preference for a regularly-scheduled meeting at which time the project
28 could be discussed.

29
30 Mr. Church pointed out that the procedure states that the applicant
31 needs to invite all those individuals whose property is located within a
32 certain distance of the subject property line, which runs along SW
33 Murray Boulevard and SW Tualatin Valley Highway. He explained
34 that rather than pick only one of the three NACs potentially involved,
35 the applicant had opted to meet in a central location and extend an
36 invitation to all three NACs.

37
38 8:00 p.m. – Development Services Manager Steven Sparks arrived.

39
40 Commissioner Maks noted that the proper procedure is specifically
41 outlined, emphasizing that the West Beaverton NAC is one of the most
42 active NACs in the City of Beaverton. Observing that the appropriate
43 neighborhood review process had not been followed, he pointed out
44 that he has never seen an issue involving this NAC where neighbors

1 did not show up. He explained that for future reference, the applicant
2 should be aware that neighborhood involvement is huge issue for the
3 Planning Commission and that including all NACs should be included
4 in this process.

5

6 Commissioner Voytilla referred to the existing auditorium, observing
7 that he is concerned whether enough parking is available to address all
8 of the potential uses that might occur simultaneously, adding that
9 sometimes scheduled events tend to overlap.

10

11 Commissioner Maks expressed concern with the effect of the combined
12 uses upon the ADT and AM/PM peak traffic periods.

13

14 Commissioner Voytilla explained that similar applications involving an
15 athletic facility added to a church, or an expansion, have involved the
16 development of a schedule of activities, including potential overlaps.

17

18 Commissioner Maks mentioned that he would like to make certain
19 that the applicant is not burdened to the point where they are unable
20 to schedule an activity in the auditorium during a basketball game in
21 the gymnasium.

22

23 Commissioner Voytilla commended the applicant for what he considers
24 an excellent job of overall design with regard to this proposal.

25

26 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

27

28 No member of the public testified with regard to this proposal.

29

30 8:12 p.m. through 8:25 p.m. – recess.

31

32 Commissioner Maks pointed out that he had just realized that he had
33 previously neglected to disclose that his wife has been employed by the
34 attorney who represents the *Sisters of St. Mary's of Oregon* for 25
35 years, emphasizing that they do not handle any land use affairs and
36 that this would not affect his ability to participate in a fair and
37 impartial decision with regard to this proposal.

38

39 No member of the audience indicated any desire to challenge
40 Commissioner Maks' participation with regard to this proposal or
41 continue this item based upon his disclosure.

42

43 On behalf of the applicant, Mr. Church requested a continuance in
44 order to allow the applicant to submit additional information with

1 regard to traffic, adding that this would provide the Planning Commis-
2 sion with the opportunity to make a better decision on this proposal.

3
4 Commissioner Maks pointed out that it would be necessary for the
5 applicant to sign a waiver with regard to the 120-day rule.

6
7 Mr. Ryerson requested clarification with regard to how much time
8 necessary for the applicant's Traffic Engineer to provide the additional
9 information, adding that it would be necessary to schedule a date
10 certain for the continuance and that paperwork must be signed in
11 order to extend the 120 day deadline.

12
13 Mr. Church advised Mr. Ryerson that the applicant would like two
14 weeks to provide the additional information.

15
16 Observing that staff would require at least one week for review of the
17 additional information followed by an additional week for review by
18 the Planning Commission, Mr. Ryerson suggested that the item be
19 continued to May 28, 2003.

20
21 Commissioner Maks questioned whether the applicant is clear with
22 regard to what is expected, and explained that it is necessary to
23 determine, under existing use, the number off vehicular trips
24 generated by this site during PM peak period, and then the additional
25 vehicular traffic that would be generated during this PM peak period
26 with the new condensed use. He pointed out that a Level of Service
27 (LOS) Study would not be necessary for these intersections that are
28 already at LOS F.

29
30 Commissioner Johansen pointed out that the applicant should also
31 provide further information with regard to parking issues.

32
33 Commissioner Voytilla questioned the amount of seating proposed for
34 the new facility.

35
36 Mr. Church advised Commissioner Voytilla that the new facility
37 involves a 1,000 seat gymnasium, emphasizing that it is not
38 anticipated that there would be more attendance at the games. He
39 pointed out that the amount of seating had been driven by the desire to
40 have adequate room in the gymnasium to allow the entire student body
41 to attend masses.

42

1 Commissioner Voytilla mentioned that a winning season can easily
2 result in a full gymnasium, and requested clarification with regard to
3 the seating capacity of the existing auditorium.

4
5 Mr. Church informed Commissioner Voytilla that the auditorium
6 currently has a capacity of 375 seats, adding that the existing
7 gymnasium has 500 seats.

8
9 Commissioner Voytilla noted that the applicant should document that
10 an adequate amount of parking is available to serve all existing and
11 potential uses.

12
13 Commissioner Winter mentioned that he would like the applicant to
14 provide information with regard to Washington County's reference to a
15 potential 25% increase in traffic.

16
17 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and Commissioner Winter **SECONDED**
18 a motion to **CONTINUE** CU 2003-0004 – Sisters of St. Mary's Gym
19 Addition Conditional Use to a date certain of May 28, 2003.

20
21 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

22
23 Commissioner Maks **MOVED** to **CONTINUE** DR 2003-0013 – Sisters
24 of St. Mary's Gym Addition Design Review to a date certain of May 28,
25 2003.

26
27 Commissioner Winter questioned whether it is necessary to reference
28 the suspension of the 120-day rule within the motion.

29
30 Commissioner Maks pointed out that the applicant has acknowledged
31 and agreed to sign a waiver of the 120-day rule.

32
33 Commissioner Voytilla **SECONDED** the motion to **CONTINUE** DR
34 2003-0013 – Sisters of St. Mary's Gym Addition Design Review to a
35 date certain of May 28, 2003.

36
37 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

38
39 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

40
41 Minutes of the meeting of March 26, 2003, submitted. Commissioner
42 Maks requested that line 16 of page 14 be amended, as follows:
43 "...importance of infrastructure **and that this infrastructure would**
44 **be costly**, he pointed out that..." Commissioner Maks requested that

1 lines 26 through 30 of page 15 be amended, as follows: "Commissioner
2 Maks expressed his opinion that ~~problems would be created due to the~~
3 ~~lack of~~ **this would not be possible without** the SW Murray
4 Boulevard Extension **and was advised by Mr. Gustafson that this**
5 **is true. He** and requested clarification with regard to the 85th
6 percentile speed on SW Barrows Road." Commissioner Johansen
7 requested that lines 8 and 9 of page 17 be amended, as follows:
8 "Commissioner Johansen ~~expressed his opinion~~ **stated** that SW
9 Barrows Road ~~is currently functioning~~ **would ultimately function** as
10 an arterial." Commissioner Johansen **MOVED** and Commissioner
11 Winter **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as
12 amended.

13
14 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner
15 Bliss, who abstained from voting on this issue.

16
17 Minutes of the meeting of April 2, 2003, submitted. Commissioner
18 Maks requested that lines 24 and 25 of page 11 be amended, as follows:
19 "Commissioner Maks **MOVED** and ~~Commissioner Winter~~
20 ~~**SECONDED** a motion to~~ **APPROVE** SB 2002-0016 – Progress Quarry
21 Subdivision..." and that line 43 of page 11 be amended, as follows:
22 "Commissioner Winter **SECONDED** the ~~amendment to the motion,~~ **as**
23 **amended.** Commissioner Winter **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks
24 **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be approved as amended.

25
26 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioner
27 Bliss, who abstained from voting on this issue.

28
29 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

30
31 Commissioner Maks mentioned that he would not be available at the
32 meeting of May 7, 2003.

33
34 The meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m.